## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

ALEMAYEHO JIMMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SEATTLE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-CV-1819-RSL

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO REOPEN CASE

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion to Reopen Dismissed Case." Dkt. #17. On April 5, 2019, the Court noted that service of the summons and complaint had not been made on defendants as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) and ordered plaintiff to show cause why the complaint should not be dismissed. Dkt. #9; see Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(5). Plaintiff filed a response on April 17, 2019. Dkt. #10. The City of Seattle filed a reply on April 23, 2019, along with a declaration from Assistant City Attorney Susan Park ("ACA Park"). Dkts. #11, #12. Plaintiff claims that he was not served with the reply and declaration from ACA Park and was not given the opportunity to respond. Dkt. #17.

A motion to reopen is addressed to the Court's sound discretion. <u>Brooks Mfg. Co. v. Dis-Tran Wood Prod., LLC</u>, No. C11-0309JLR, 2012 WL 12865267, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 12, 2012) (citing <u>In re Roxford Foods</u>, 12 F.3d 875, 879 (9th Cir. 1993)). The City's response includes a Certificate of Service indicating that it was mailed to plaintiff at the address

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO REOPEN CASE - 1

appearing in the Court docket. Dkt. #11 at 4. However, as plaintiff claims he did not receive it, the Court will nevertheless permit plaintiff to file a reply.

For all the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion is GRANTED. The Clerk of Court is hereby DIRECTED to serve plaintiff with the City's response, see Dkt. #11, and the declaration of ACA Park, see Dkt. #12. Plaintiff is DIRECTED to file his reply within two weeks from the date of this order. The Court hereby VACATES the judgment entered in favor of defendants on April 25, 2019. See Dkt. #16.

DATED this 20th day of June, 2019.

Robert S. Lasnik

United States District Judge